

REMARKS

According to the most recent office action, claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-30, 32-38, and 40-56 are pending in the application. These same claims stand rejected.

Telephonic Interview

On December 4, 2007, examiner Brent Stace, supervising examiner Apu M. Mofiz, and the undersigned conducted a telephonic interview. During the interview, various aspects of claim 1 were discussed that are specifically addressed below.

Specification

During the telephonic interview, the undersigned explained to the examiner why claim 8 (and other claims reciting similar subject matter) was recited in the present manner. Examiner Stace indicated that he understood the applicant's position. Withdrawal of this objection is earnestly solicited.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

Claims 10, 20, and 27 have been amended to address the examiner's rejection. Claims 11, 21, and 28 have been canceled. Without conceding the propriety of these rejections, the applicant herein has amended or canceled the aforementioned claims in order to expedite prosecution.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 11, 21, and 28 have been canceled.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

During the telephonic interview, examiner Stace and Mofiz discussed how "REDO_DATA" attribute 340 in Lehman (U.S. Patent No. 5,485,608), as shown for example in Fig. 3, mapped onto the allegedly corresponding claim limitations. The undersigned disagreed with the mapping, noting how the Lehman reference fell short of disclosing the previously added limitation of "at least one entry from said *allocation layer* is *local* to its

corresponding computing device of a plurality of computing devices and said at least one entry from said *B-link tree layer* is *replicated among said plurality of computing devices.*”

However in order to expedite prosecution and taking into advisement the feedback provided by examiners Stace and Mofiz, the independent claims have been amended in the following manner:

- **Claim 1** has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 7 and 8. Claims 7 and 8 have, in turn, been canceled.
- **Claim 12** has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 17 and 18. Claims 17 and 18 have, in turn, been canceled.
- **Claim 22** has been amended merely to provide proper antecedent basis. It recites a “single log” whose features define over the cited art in light of the description in paragraph [0086].
- **Claim 29** has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 35 and 36. Claims 35 and 36 have, in turn, been canceled.
- **Claim 38** has been amended per subject matter disclosed in claims 7 and 8.
- **Claim 46** recites a “single log” whose features define over the cited art in light of the description in paragraph [0086].
- **Claim 51** has been amended per subject matter disclosed in claims 7 and 8.
- **Claim 53** recites a notion of “truncating” that patentably defines over the cited art at least for the reasons expressed in paragraph [0078].
- **Claim 55** recites a “single log” whose features define over the cited art in light of the description in paragraph [0086].

The applicant has carefully studied the Lehman reference in detail and has taken the examiner’s rejections in the office action into advisement (as well as the comments made during the telephonic interview), and concludes that all the independent claims patentably define over any cited art.

The applicant also notes the present amendments incorporate limitations from dependent claims (or are made to provide proper antecedent basis), thus no new search is

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2557/304882.01
Application No.: 10/674,676
Office Action Dated: July 5, 2007

PATENT

necessitated thereby.

Should the examiner have any questions, remarks, or suggestions, the undersigned respectfully asks to be contacted at 206-903-2461.

Date: January 4, 2008

/ Grzegorz S. Plichta /
Grzegorz S. Plichta
Registration No. 55,541

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439